

REMARKS

Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 47-56 will be pending.

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Claims 37-46 have been rejected as being unpatentable in view of Pepe et al. Applicants submit that the new claims submitted with this amendment are patentable over these references and any other references of record, whether considered alone or in any proper combination.

The present amendment adds new independent claim 47. This claim recites a messaging application program interface, a network interface, a messaging facility, and remote enterprise applications. The API and network interface interface the messaging facility with the remote enterprise applications. Support for these features may be found with reference to Figs. 1 and 2. See, for example, API 145, network interface 127, server 125 (which comprises a messaging facility), and a remote enterprise application 210 running on server 190. Also see, for example, page 8, lines 14-15, page 9, lines 1-4; page 7, lines 16-20; and page 10, lines 6-10.

Claim 47 further recites plural sender computers, each of the plural sender computers comprising a message compose mechanism to compose a message and compose a corresponding designation. The corresponding designation comprises destination information identifying (i) a set of multiple human recipients and (ii) different modalities for transmitting messages to respective ones of the multiple human recipients. Support for these features may be found, for example, at page 7, lines 18-20. See also, for example, the top of Fig. 2, and page 17, lines 16-17. See also, page 7, lines 12-15.

Claim 47 further recites a message and designation receive mechanism to receive, from the remote enterprise application via the network connection, the message and corresponding designation. Support for this feature may be found, for example, at page 7, line 21 through page 8, line 2. Claim 47 further recites a messaging facility direction mechanism to direct the messaging facility to effect transmission of each of the messages to their corresponding destinations in accordance with their corresponding designations. Support for this feature may be found, for example, at the text starting at page 7, line 21 and extending to page 8, line 2. Also see, for example, page 11, lines 5-12; and the text starting at page 17, line 11.

Applicants submit that claim 47 and each of the claims dependent thereon are patentable under §102 and §103, for at least the following reasons. Specifically, Pepe et al., a reference applied to reject the claims, fail to teach or suggest several features, and none of the references of record considered in any proper combination remedies the deficiencies of Pepe et al.

Pepe et al. do not teach or suggest a sender composing a message, and a set of multiple human recipients. Rather, the Pepe et al. system has a subscriber specify a profile for the message he receives or sends. Nothing is said within the Pepe et al. patent about composing a message or a set of human recipients for that message.

Pepe et al. do not teach or suggest a sender composing different modalities for respective ones of the human recipients. Rather, Pepe et al. allow a given subscriber to specify modalities for messages he receives or sends, but do not describe anything about specifying for a given message a set of plural human recipients, and specifying different modalities for respective ones of those recipients (for that message).

Pepe et al. also fail to teach or suggest a designation comprising a set of multiple human recipients. We note that the outstanding Office Action reads different devices as being

different recipients, to reject previously-submitted claim 37. In contrast, Pepe et al. do not describe any features concerning composing a set of plural human recipients for a given message. Rather, Pepe et al. focus on specifying a subscriber profile for messages the subscriber sends or receives. Nothing is disclosed in the Pepe et al. reference regarding the profile having information regarding different human recipients for a given message.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that new claims 47-56 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. A notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Application No. 09/621,188

Filed: July 21, 2000

TC Art Unit: 2155

Confirmation No.: 3752

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFREY DELANEY ET AL.

By: 

Anthony L. Miele  
Registration No. 34,393  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,  
GAGNEBIN & LEOVICI LLP  
Ten Post Office Square  
Boston, MA 02109  
Telephone: (617) 542-2290  
Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

ALM/ad  
305926-1